

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

1-15-2002

January 15, 2002

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "January 15, 2002" (2002). *Minutes*. 208.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/208

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR JANUARY 15, 2002 (Vol. XXXI, No. 15)

The Faculty Senate agenda is posted weekly on the Web, at 1162 Life Science Building, and at 2504 Buzzard Hall.

I. Call to order by Bud Fischer at 2:01 p.m. (Conference Room, 2540 Buzzard Building)

Present: R. Benedict, J. Best, D. Brandt, G. Canivez, D. Carpenter, D. Carwell, J. Dilworth, R. Fischer, M. Monippallil, J. Pommier, S. Scher, J. Tidwell, B. Young, A. Zahlan. Excused: L. Clay Mendez. Guests: J. Fetty, W. Davidson, D. Fernandez, B. Lord.

II. Approval of the minutes of January 8, 2002.

Motion (Benedict/Carpenter) to approve the minutes of January 8, 2002.

Corrections: Zahlan: III. G. line 4: My comment was the faculty representative to the B.O.T. must be elected, not that they be voting members. However, that is important as well. Zahlan: IV. A. 1. paragraph 2 line 8: Clarify that the "you" referred to in my comment was directed toward R. Fischer.

Yes: Benedict, Best, Brandt, Carpenter, Carwell, Fischer, Monippallil, Pommier, Tidwell, Zahlan. **Abstain:** Scher, Young. **Passed.**

III. Communications

- A. Letter sent to J. Pommier regarding policies related to replacement of Panther Cards.
Fischer: The current policy is if the card fails within the first year of issue, it is replaced for free. If it fails after that, a ten dollar charge is made to replace it. If the card is lost, it is a twenty dollar charge. Any amount of money stored on the cards is lost. Clay Hopkins (Telecommunications) is trying to have the policy changed so that anyone who needs to use their card on a daily basis to enter and exit buildings for their work can have their card replaced for free. Scher: The policy seems backward. If the failure is during the first year, it would seem that the failure is more likely caused by abuse. Failure after the first year would more likely come from normal usage. Pommier: If my credit card "breaks" the company replaces it for free. Zahlan: Credit cards are regularly replace on two or three year cycles. Tidwell: Isn't First Illinois involved in this in some way? Monippallil: Ten dollars for replacement is excessive. The charge should not exceed the replacement cost. Fischer: I checked and ten dollars is the actual charge to replace the card. Carwell: If it is used that much, it is going to need to be replaced. Fischer: My first card fell apart within the first two years just sitting in my locker. Pommier: My card was replaced for free because they told me it was an old style card. D. Fernandez: Was the policy change for faculty or both students and faculty? Zahlan: Wasn't the policy change that those that need it for their job can get a free replacement? Tidwell: Wasn't there initially a problem with library usage? Fischer: There was a problem concerning social security numbers being used. Scher: The University ought to suspend usage of social security numbers for any purpose. Carwell: Those are student ID numbers that just happen to be identical to social security numbers. Fischer: We will find out the real policy about social security number usage and we will get Clay Hopkins here to tell us about the Panther Card policy. W. Davidson: We went through all of this for a couple of years. Money on a card is replaceable if your card is damaged. It cannot be replaced if you lose your card.
- B. Email from International Programs announcing the next International Tea on Wednesday, January 23, 2002 from 2:00-4:00 p.m. in the Charleston-Mattoon room.
- C. Email from Seth Quinn asking that we appoint a faculty member to the Student Senate Tuition and Fees Review Committee.
Fischer: D. Brandt is already appointed to that committee.
- D. Email asking if we knew who the chair of the Distinguished Faculty Committee is because someone already wants to make a nomination.

IV. Old Business

A. Committees

1. **Executive Committee:** Fischer: No report.
2. **Nominations:** Canivez: I am preparing a list of positions for which appointments need to be made.
3. **Elections:** Benedict: No report.
4. **Student-Faculty Relations:** Benedict: No report.
5. **Faculty-Staff Relations:** Young: No report.
6. **Search Committees:**

a. **University President Search Committee:** Fischer: There are over forty applicants. We are going to cut that down to about ten to twelve by the end of the month for off-campus interviews. Scher: What fraction look like serious contenders? Fischer: All I can say is that there are some good applicants. Carpenter:

Would you say the majority of the candidates have Ph.D.'s? Fischer: Yes, or other terminal degrees.

b. AVPAA for Technology: Tidwell: The search web site is up. The ad in the Chronicle of Higher Education will appear February 1st. We will probably start looking at applications the end of February.

B. Faculty Retention: Fischer: I have asked the VPAA's office for data about how many faculty live outside the area.

C. CUPB Bylaws: Fischer: Everyone received a copy of the Proposed CUPB Bylaws. What are your comments on the proposed changes? Carpenter: The language proposed to be cut out was supported by Faculty Senate to be retained. The changes were proposed by Dr. Surles. The proposed changes were supported by the University and BOT attorneys. I believe this is the first time the BOT has attempted to micro-manage University internal policy. On Friday, I am going to vote to table these proposed changes. I think we should hear the new president's input on these. This could also serve as a litmus test of the new president's views on shared governance. Carwell: Didn't you (Fischer) indicate that there was a problem with current bylaws? Fischer: I did, but I was incorrect. The current bylaws are in place. Carpenter: Before Dr. Jorns left campus, he suggested substantive changes. Dr. Surles stated she had no interest in changing the bylaws, but then the executive committee came forward with these changes. Tidwell: The only substantive change Dr. Surles made was that the president had been the chair of CUPB and is now only an Ex Officio member. On this proposal, planning has been struck. Carpenter: I don't know how that fits in, but it looks strange here. Young: In looking at article VI here, it says the president will report to CUPB as to final decisions on the budget. Carpenter: Through the Rive's and Jorns' administrations, CUPB would be given a list of proposed projects funds might be spent on. We would go to our constituents to get input to help us rank the projects. We would send our rankings back to the president. When Dr. Surles arrived, that process was stopped. Monippallil: The bylaws that have existed the past five or six years have worked well. The University counsels have stated the bylaws must be changed. I think we should ask that the proposed changes be tabled until evidence that supports their statements are demonstrated. Zahlan: You're stating that tabling the proposed changes would be safer than voting no on the proposed changes? Fischer: My voting no may not mean anything. We are only three among twenty members, so I don't have any idea where we stand on voting. Carpenter: My tabling is based on the fact that we have more important things to discuss such as the budget recision and also allowing the incoming president to have some input. Tidwell: We changed to this language because, when I was chair, we could not get one of the vice presidents to give us the information that we needed. Canivez: I think you should approach the meeting with a first goal of tabling the proposed changes. If that is not possible, then have the question divided. Monippallil: I think the Senate should consider a motion recommending this action.

Motion (Monipallil/Carpenter): The Faculty Senate urges members of the Council on University Planning and Budget to table the proposed changes to its bylaws until the incoming president has had an opportunity to review those changes. Yes: Benedict, Best, Brandt, Canivez, Carpenter, Carwell, Dilworth, Fischer, Monippallil, Pommier, Scher, Tidwell, Young, Zahlan. **Passed.**

C. Spring Forum: Fischer: We need to get this out, so if there is still back-up at the Print Center, we will produce the minutes in some other way to get them out. Dilworth: I think Senate members should email their constituents about the forum. Zahlan: I don't think we should break into small groups that are competing with each other for resources. Tidwell: We have had one big group and it only ended up being a complaint session. Zahlan: I don't think big or small groups determine whether it will just be whining and moaning. Monippallil: If there is not a specific topic, all you will get is people airing their peeves. If we have fifty people, one group makes sense. If there are one hundred fifty people, then it would be better to break into groups. Tidwell: There have been about a hundred the last couple of years. Young: Reed sent us a good resource to use. Fischer: We need to come out of this with some recommendations for the President and the VPAA. Scher: I agree that we do need to have some sort of recommendation for implementation. Benedict: The break out sessions the last two years have been productive. Dilworth: It didn't matter how the groups were broken up. Last year, all three groups came up with the same ideas. Monippallil: Three years ago, the University proposed a development plan with a punitive aspect. After about three weeks of discussion, UPI came and said you can file it wherever you file things. If there is any punitive aspect, the faculty will not approve it. Best: That was a poor first step. In looking at peer institutions, the more faculty are in control of assessment, development, etc., the better it works. The faculty should own faculty development. Let's move it forward. Fischer: This is proactive for us. We are nowhere near our peer institutions in faculty development resources. B. Lord: I, as provost, am very interested in supporting Faculty Senate in bolstering faculty development. I could hardly find faculty development when I got to this campus. I do want to hear a plan from the Faculty Senate. Scher: My proposal is that first someone give an overview of faculty development here and at some other institutions. Then the meeting can break into groups. The groups would get back together with each group coming back with recommendations on three or four items. We can list the

recommendations of each group and discuss which are the most important. The Senate can forward that to the provost. Canivez: We should not restrict recommendations based on the current budget constraints. Some of our suggestions can be long term goals. Tidwell: Just as in the case of technology, if we have a plan, we can go find the funds to implement it. Fischer: Do we want breakout sessions or not? No objections to breakout sessions? We agree on breakout sessions. What should we talk about in these sessions? Zahlan: I again don't want to create bureaucracy. Canivez: I think administrative structure is premature until we know what we need or want. Fischer: How do we put that in a question? Canivez: What should faculty development be? Scher: I think we should have separate groups for service, teaching, research, and balance between work and life. Zahlan: You could take the first four questions that Bonnie Irwin provided and use those, or combine them and edit them a bit. Best: You could get what Steve (Scher) wants within that framework. Fischer: Anne is in charge of rewriting those. Send it to all the Senate members and then they can comment on it.

V. New Business

A. Panther Card: Fischer: We've already discussed this. (Refer to III. A.)

B. Elections: Fischer: How is the week before Spring Break? Carpenter: The only problem is a lot of people leave early that week. Fischer: I thought if we hold them Tuesday and Wednesday that week, most faculty would still be around.

C. Other: Carpenter: How much is the recision? B. Lord: It is 2.337 million dollars. Carpenter: Is it true that most of it will come from Academic Affairs and Business Affairs? B. Lord: Nothing is final, but most of the budget is in those two areas. Much of the money in other areas comes from different sources. Canivez: I suggest dropping the temperature another three or four degrees. B. Lord: Facilities management wants to know if your office is below 68° so they can adjust the heating. It's a balance problem.

VII. Adjourn: Scher/Benedict: 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Brandt, Recorder